HUMANIORA

VOLUME 26 No. 2 Juni 2014 Halaman 187-202

TRANSFORMATION OF *LUDRUK* PERFORMANCES: FROM POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT AND STATE HEGEMONY TO CREATIVE SURVIVAL STRATEGY

Ikwan Setiawan*
Sutarto*

ABSTRAK

Artikel ini membahas tansformasi pertunjukan ludruk, dari era Soekarno sampai Reformasi. Dalam mendiskusikan permasalahan tersebut, kami menerapkan perspektif cultural studies. Dari analisis kami, terdapat tiga temuan terkait transformasi wacana dalam cerita ludruk. Pertama, di era Soekarno, banyak grup ludruk bergabung dengan Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat (Lekra). Akibatnya, grup ludruk memanggungkan beberapa cerita provokatif yang memaparkan permasalahan rakyat jelata dan mengkritisi keyakinan Islam. Kedua, setelah tragedi berdarah 1965, aparat militer regional mengendalikan grup ludruk dan pertunjukan mereka, termasuk cerita-ceritanya. Pada era ini, cerita ludruk mendukung program pembangunan nasional rezim Orde Baru dan meningkatkan konsensus rakyat tentang pentingnya militerisme melalui beberapa cerita perlawanan rakyat terhadap penjajah. Ketiga, pada era Reformasi, beberapa grup ludruk menciptakan cerita-cerita baru yang menarik terkait permasalahan social dalam masyarakat kontemporer. Pada akhirnya, kami menyimpulkan bahwa moda transformasi melalui penciptaan cerita-cerita baru-berbasis-permasalahan social yang berkelindan dengan kondisi historis memiliki sejarah panjang dalam pertunjukan ludruk. Sebagai tambahan, dalam era periode Reformasi di mana kapitalisme pasar menjadi ideologi dan praktik dominan, cerita-cerita baru tersebut dan terobosan-terobosan dalam pemanggungan bisa menjadi strategi survival-kreatif yang sesuai bagi grup ludruk di tengah-tengah popularitas budaya-tekno sebagai selera dan orientasi dominan dalam masyarakat.

Kata Kunci: *hegemoni, keterlibatan politik, pertunjukan ludruk, strategi kreatif-untuk-survive, transformasi*

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the transformation of ludruk performances, from Soekarno to Reformation era. In discussing the problem, we apply a cultural studies perspective. From our analysis, there are three findings related to the discursive transformation of ludruk stories. Firstly, in the era of Soekarno, many ludruk groups joined Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat (Lekra/Institute of People's Culture), which had many ideological similarities with Partai Komunis Indonesia (PKI/ Indonesian Communist Party). Consequently, ludruk groups performed some provocative stories that exposed the problems of lower-class people and criticized Islamic religious beliefs. Secondly, after the bloody 1965 tragedy, the regional military apparatuses controlled ludruk groups and their performances, including the stories. In this era, ludruk stories supported the New Order regime's national development programs and raised people's consensus on the significance of militarism

* Literature Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Jember

through popular stories about people's resistance to colonizers. Thirdly, in the Reformation era, some ludruk groups make newer, interesting stories about many complicated social problems in contemporary society. Finally, we conclude that this mode of transformation through creating newer, social problem-based stories that intertwine with historical conditions has deep historical roots in ludruk performances. In addition, during the Reformation period in which market capitalism becomes a dominant ideology and practice, such newer stories and breakthroughs of staging may become a suitable creative survival strategy for ludruk groups in the midst of techno-cultural popularity as the dominant taste and orientation in societies.

Keywords: creative survival strategy, hegemony, ludruk performances, political involvement, transformation

INTRODUCTION

In the 1930s, Gondo Durasim (Cak Durasim) and his friends founded the first *ludruk* organization in Surabaya, *Ludruk Organisatie*. In these pre-independent revolution times, ludruk performance—a popular folk drama in Surabaya and some regions near it—became a medium to disseminate critiques of the cruelties of the colonial regime. The common people deeply understood the social and economic injustices in society which were caused by colonial systems, which gave more beneficiaries for the colonizers. Such conditions were a discursive arena from which Cak Durasim and his friends created thematic narratives and performed them on stage. Although they did not negate the entertaining function of ludruk, they always tried to represent people's miseries in the performances—through *kidungan* (introductory song using Javanese language), humor, and the main stories—as endeavors to awaken spectators' revolutionary spirits. Due to the critiques and subversive offerings, the Dutch regime, before 1940, banned ludruk performances and liquidated ludruk organizations as their curative policy in blocking the wider spread of the revolutionary spirit. The arrival of Japanese colonizers in 1942 seemed to give a new opportunity for ludruk artists to exist, because this new regime re-legalized ludruk organizations and performances. However, the Japanese regime used ludruk performances as a medium of propaganda, particularly for disseminating the ideas of Great Eastern Asia to be under their control. Nevertheless, in a live performance, Cak Durasim criticized the Japanese colonizers overtly through his popular *parikan* (humorously-rhymed song): "pagupon omae doro/ melu Nippon tambah sengsara (*pagupon is the home of pigeons/following Nippon is more sorrow*). Because of this *parikan*, Japanese apparatuses imprisoned Cak Durasim until his death (Susanto, 2012).

Based on the above cases, in its early popularity as folk performance art, ludruk artists absorbed many social issues and problems in society to critique the injustice of the ruling regimes through *arek* language (a Javanese dialect used in Surabaya and some regions near it that has no linguistic level based on social strata). Through kidungans, spectators understood humor easily, and through the realist narratives in *arek*, they understood the social critiques and revolutionary messages of ludruk performances. In other words, it was not only the politico-intellectual leaders such as Soekarno, Hatta, Dr. Sutomo, Tan Malaka, Sjahrir, etc., who took role in empowering people's consensual awareness on the importance of independence. Cak Durasim and his friends also took an important and direct role to awaken the spirit of folk resistance against the colonial regimes who exploited the natural and human resources of Indonesia.

Indeed, there are some previous studies which focus on ludruk as their study. Peacock (1968), for example, researched ludruk and its relation to socio-economic conditions and the dissemination of modern values, but his time focus had not yet reached the post-Soekarno period. With a different accentuation, Supriyanto (1992) paid attention to the history, stories, and aesthetic aspects in ludruk performances. He also stated

the significance of resistant stories in colonial settings as public learning, particularly to criticize the repressive authority that brought misery to the lower class. Nevertheless, he did not criticize why the stories resisting against colonizers were very popular in the New Order period. Samidi (2006) discussed the relation between the spectators and the development of two kinds of traditional theatre, namely ludruk and *wayang wong* (a drama performing Mahabharata and Ramayana stories in high Javanese language) in Surabaya from 1950-1965. The attendance of spectators in performances is an important aspect, particularly in providing financial support for the members of the troupes. Consequently, the troupes should make their fans feel happy and at the same time obey the local government's regulations. Those previous research studies, at least, indicate an absence of academic investigation of ludruk from a critical standpoint, which focuses on the operation of power through performances and its relation to the wider political and cultural milieu.

This article discusses the transformation of ludruk performances in post-colonial times, from the period of Soekarno's regime to the period of the Reformation regime, and its relation to historical context, namely socio-economic conditions and politico-ideological formations. We have a different framework from Subiyantoro (2010) who conceives of transformation as the changing of surface structure, not the deep structure, without taking into account its complicated process. Transformation, for us, points out the changes of discourses in the stories and elements of performances as a way to appropriate cultural trends, such as the model of staging and the addition of an interactive musical show, although the performing structure does not change. Modifying Aschroft's perspective (2002; 2001), we consider transformation as an intentional appropriation of new discourses and practices conducted by local actors—in this case, ludruk artists—as the strategic and flexible breakthrough in the midst of economic, cultural, and socio-political changes, although in particular cases, this will make them engaged within the dominant ideology. By such conception, we find some problems to discuss as follows: (1) specific discourses in ludruk stories from each period; (2) contextual conditions which influence the changing of discourses; (3) how particular political power operates within ludruk performances in each period; and, (4) the effects of transformation for ludruk performances and groups.

In reaching the goal of the study and answering the above questions, we apply cultural studies perspectives, particularly Foucauldian discourse and Gramscian hegemony. For Foucault (1989), a discourse is a group of statements related to a singular formula of meaningful objects and a limited group of statements related to a similar discursive formation. As a regime of truth, discourse will engender knowledge and construct various discursive subjects that also produce power operations and relations in particular historical settings. Discourse is not simply that which translates struggles or systems of domination, but it is the thing for which and by which there is struggle; it is the power which is to be seized (Foucault, 1981:53). Further, the power operation is circulating; not top-down, not repressive, and coming from unlimited points (Foucault, 1998:94-95). The concept of discourse and power/ knowledge has a close relationship with hegemony, particularly in the term of power operation and relation through cultural and moral knowledge. Hegemony is a mode of power that emphasizes intellectual, cultural, and moral leadership in which the ruling class articulates common interests, both economically and ideologically, to create a popular consensus and historical bloc that support the regime's authority (Gramsci, 2006; Boggs, 1984; Howson & Smith, 2008; Joseph, 2002). However, hegemonic power is never stable and always needs newer negotiations because in its operation, there can be resistance from other social classes when they lack advantages and the dominant class begins practicing coercive power.

Those two approaches are useful not only in analyzing data, but they also act as a framework for finding and collecting data through qualitative research, which combines field and library/

documentary research. To collect the primary data related to the problems, we conducted field research in Mojokerto regency, a place where some famous ludruk groups with their artists still exist and gain popularity in the midst of cultural changes today. In collecting data, we applied in-depth interview to explore information from a leader of a ludruk group, while participatory observations were useful for knowing the real condition of ludruk performances, including the public perception in recent times. In library research, we read and analyzed some important secondary data from previous books, journal articles, newspapers, and online media.

In analyzing process, a Foucauldian perspective provides important concepts and operational framework to criticize the transformation of particular discourses mobilized in the ludruk performances in each period and its historical context, including political, social, and economic conditions. Gramscian perspective gives us a significant viewpoint in understanding the relations between ludruk stories and particular power operations in each period. By using these two perspectives, we analyze the data based on the goal of this study, namely analyzing the transformation of post-colonial ludruk stories and its relation to historical conditions and politico-ideological interests. Since there have been different historical conditions in the Reformation period, particularly in the rapid growth of technological-based, cultural industries as the dominant color of cultural milieu driven by neoliberal expansion, we will analyze the characteristics of the recent ludruk stories and the creative survival strategy conducted by ludruk artists and groups. It is very possible for them to create contemporary, social problem-based stories to attract their viewers. Through this strategy, at once they may handle economic problems and negotiate ideal conceptions of contemporary problems to the viewers.

We will analyze, firstly, the emergence of social critique discourses in ludruk performance under the Soekarno period. In this period, Lekra (*Institute of People's Culture*) incorporated many ludruk organizations in East Java as their venue to awaken people's critical consciousness in the cultural domain and to disseminate communist ideology. After the bloody 1965 tragedy, the militaristic regimes took over many ludruk organizations and controlled their performances, particularly the stories, with the endeavor to prevent the return of people-oriented themes as the characteristic of communist ideology. Based on the historical context of these two periods, we will explore the characteristics of social critique discourses in ludruk performances and their relations to particular power operations in each period. In the more recent Reformation period, ludruk organizations are free from the state regime's control, both in their managerial and performance activities. In this period, it is interesting to discuss the transformation of ludruk stories and survival strategy conducted by ludruk groups in the midst of the popularity of technological-based cultural industries. It is possible for ludruk artists to create newer stories that address the contemporary socio-cultural, economic, and political problems in society.

SOCIAL CRITIQUE UNDER COMMUNIST DOCTRINES

After independence in 1945, in the midst of the national spirit to solve many social and economic problems, the Indonesian political atmosphere was colored by the contestation of many parties with their particular ideologies—traditionalist and modernist Islam, nationalist-secular, socialist, and communist. Each party tried to mobilize popular issues such as poverty, education, nationalism, and progress of life for the sake of their political interests and goals, particularly in captivating people's sympathy and voices as the first step to take a role in state governance. The cultural domain was one of the important keys which could support their attempts in reaching their goals. Consequently, each party founded cultural institutions as their (semi) autonomic organizations, which could play important roles in both entertaining and raising

people's awareness and endorsement for parties.

PKI (Partai Komunis Indonesia/*Indonesia Communist Party*) was a party that was very actively in mobilizing the masses based on crucial issues such as poverty and land reform. In the cultural domain, PKI always articulated the importance of people's cultural development as one strategic way to build a strong national identity. At its implementation, some of PKI's leaders such as Njoto and D.N Aidit contributed to the founding of Lekra as a cultural institution, which emphasized empowering folk art and artists in their programs. Immediately, Lekra gained popularity among folk artists in Indonesia because of its promise for developing folk art. In East Java, many ludruk artists from various groups in Surabaya, Mojokerto, Malang, Jombang, and other regencies joined this institution. This reality could not be separated from the commitment of ludruk artists to the revolutionary movement and the daily problems of the lower class, which in many cases, matched Lekra's constitution and programs.

As a consequence of this process of involvement, many ludruk organizations in East Java were much influenced by Lekra's politico-ideological interests, not only in the way they managed and mobilized their members, but also in the narratives that were performed on stage. Following the guidance of Lekra, particularly in creating narratives in the sense of socialist realism, ludruk artists began doing participatory observation into the people's daily problems in order to find interesting themes, which might raise popular sympathy. Eko Edy Susanto (hereafter Susanto), the leader of Ludruk *Karya Budaya*, Mojokerto, says:

> "Ludruk performances became the proletariats' idol because they presented stories carrying social critique towards "not-pro-public" governmental policies. Through the stories, the people were satisfied because they felt their daily problems being represented imaginatively." (Interview, 12 November 2013)

Ludruk artists who were affiliated with Lekra found a precise formula for incorporating the proletariat's misery through social stories. Therefore, for PKI, such cultural conditions gave political advantage because the public sympathy was enhanced. However, they also adopted some national issues such as the regional military rebellion in Sumatra and Sulawesi. Discursively, the commitment to national issues was in line with PKI's policy in supporting Soekarno's programs, particularly in taking military action for handling regional subversions. In other words, in its relation to the state's policies, Lekra-affiliated groups had contextual discursive positions based on their ideological interests.

Besides these two themes, ludruk artists created sensitive stories on religious affairs. By these three dominant thematic stories, the performances of Lekra-affiliated ludruk groups gained popularity in public cultural spheres, although in many cases, their performance often triggered controversial responses, particularly from oppositional ideological factions. Some provocative stories were performed about religiously sensitive themes correlating with acute social problems. For example, ludruk artists reinterpreted sacral discourses in Islamic teaching, such as Allah as the One, in a secular way.

> In Jombang, a basis region of NU mass, Lekra performed a story entitled *Gusti Allah Ngunduh Mantu* (God Gets a Child-in-Law). In this story, performed by the most famous group in Jombang, *Arum Dalu*, Allah, the One for Muslims, was perceived as having a child. There was also a story entitled *Kawine Malaikat Jibril* (The Marriage of Gabriel)… During 1965, ludruk groups…in East Java were braver and more critical. The provocative stories, such as *Gusti Allah Dadi Manten* (God Gets Married) and *Malaikat Kimpoi* (Angels Have Sex), were often performed in some regions, which became the basis of art groups under the guidance of Lekra. The people of East Java, who have been more expressive… in their cultures, performed ludruk with a story *Malaikat Kipo*. The word "kipo" means "pipe" which functioned as a channel. This story addressed the rebellion of people against landowners under the land-reform program. The kyai (Islamic religious teacher) was a

symbol of the noble, upper class (*priyayi*) that owned larger lands. Angels became the defender of the lower class people to gain their land rights. ("Gusti Allah Pun Ngunduh Mantu", *Tempo*, 30th September 2013.p.98-99, our translation)

The more controversial story, of course, was *Matinya Gusti Allah* (the Death of God) that made many Muslims in East Java angry. Although there was no precise data about it, for many Muslims, *Matinya Gusti Allah* was active propaganda from PKI which provoked their religious beliefs about the might of God. Indeed all the controversial stories performed by the ludruk groups under communist doctrines were the creative and critical reactions toward acute social problems in society were still entrapped by feudal and strict religious discourses and practices. For Lekra, the future conditions might make lower class people live miserably and never find a progressive way in reaching economic welfare because the people always followed the kyai's religious words without having a comprehensive understanding about life.

We read the boldness of ludruk groups to perform the religiously sensitive stories as a creative breakthrough which had an ideological goal, firstly, to teach the masses to have secular thinking, particularly for disengaging earthly complicated processes such as economic and political activities from heavenly ideals as taught by religious teachers in village areas. To empower people's culture as the main source of national culture which could strengthen revolutionary ideology in the midst of the proletariat mass, it was important at those times to "fertilize" common awareness on the crucial necessity of radical thinking towards feudal-religious dogma and power. Secondly, such early mental indoctrination of the proletariats through ludruk performances could be a starting point for preparing massive political actions under the control of communist forces. In other words, the ideological involvement of ludruk groups and performances in East Java gave a cultural benefit for PKI, particularly in empowering their proletarian base in villages as a strategy for winning the political vote nationally.

POPULARITY OF RESISTANT STORIES IN THE NEW ORDER ERA

As a way to cleanse communist ideological traces in cultural spheres, both in cities and villages, the New Order regime banned ludruk groups and their performances for several years in East Java because of their involvement in Lekra. Many ludruk artists who were safe from the mass killing stopped their stage activities and experienced deep trauma. However, this new regime knew the potential contribution of folk art in disseminating ideological discourses. As a residual culture, following Williams' terminology (2006), ludruk still had a public aura because of its historical roots, which could make peasants come to the performance. Hence, the regional New Order regime incorporated ludruk into their cultural policies. However, according to Kartolo, a famous and senior ludruk artist in Surabaya, for clearing away the rest of the communist ideological traces, the regime apparatus required the artists who wanted to join new ludruk groups to undergo a "self-purification ritual". One of the common forms was signing a declaration letter of non-partisanship (*Tempo*, ibid).

The military apparatuses in East Java merged many artists of some popular groups in the Soekarno period into new groups under their control.

Table 1
New Ludruk Groups Founded and Guided by Military Apparatuses in East Java in the 1970s

New Group	Previous Group	City
Wijaya Kusuma Unit I	Marhaen	Surabaya
Wijaya Kusuma Unit IV	Tresna Enggal	Surabaya
Wijaya Kusuma Unit II	Anoraga	Malang
Wijaya Kusuma Unit III	Uril A	Malang

Source: Susanto, interview, 12 November 2013.

Besides those mergers, in some regencies, the military apparatuses also founded some new

groups by undertaking many leading artists in the previous period (Ishommudin, 2013). In Jombang, the apparatuses founded Ludruk *Putra Bhirawa* and *Bintang Jaya*. In Madiun, the air force apparatuses in Madiun founded Ludruk *Trisula Dharma*. The usage of Javanese and Sanskrit names, which were commonly used in military institutions, indicates at once the discursive control of the state regime towards popular folk culture and the positioning of the artists as the "messengers of new national consciousness" under the New Order authority. Despite whether they liked or disliked the perceptions, ludruk artists had to follow the new rules if they still wanted to continue their creativity and receive some economic benefits from cultural activities.

One of the implications of such control was that ludruk artists, either for commercial events in the houses of rich families in villages or in state-sponsored performances, should present dominant cultural discourses idealized by the state regime. Fertilizing nationalism in the midst of modern development programs in all aspects of society was one of the discourses. Nationalism in the hand of the New Order regime became an important ideological discourse, which was mobilized through educational institutions from elementary school to higher education levels, indoctrination activities for common citizens and public servants, televisions programs, newspapers, and films. Interestingly, the state apparatuses tended to expose anti-colonial nationalism, which always conceived of colonizers (particularly Dutch colonizers), as the common enemy of the nation since their authority in the past resulted in national misery, in economic, political, and cultural aspects. Such misery became a rational argument for raising national sentiment and creating binary oppositions between Indonesian people and the Dutch, although administratively they had independence since 1945.

Because ludruk groups had revised their ideological and creative orientations—beginning in 1970s—the artists had to follow military directions in conducting their performances, including the kind of preferred stories and other political messages through kidungans and parikans. Resistant stories in colonial settings were one of the characteristics of ludruk performances. The resistance against the Dutch colonizers—using a local term called *kompeni*—in the New Order period indicated the mobilization of anti-colonial nationalism through ludruk performances. For us, what is interesting to discuss is the appearance of civil folk heroes in the resistant stories that play dominant roles in the rebellion against kompeni.

For example, in a story entitled *Sogol Pendekar Sumur Gemuling* (Sogol the Warrior of Gemuling Well), the main character, Sogol, individually conducts "Robin Hood" actions by robbing the wealthy families—both from the Dutch and the native people—and giving the robbed materials to the poor families in his village. The colonial exploitation increased the poverty of the villagers because they had to give their harvest to kompeni via the village's apparatuses. Driven by his anger to see such injustice and poverty experienced by the poor natives, Sogol decides to carry out the robberies, though such actions make him a public enemy, not only in the eyes of kompeni, but also in the eyes of the rich natives. How can Sogol have such bravery? He has a supernatural power which makes him safe from injury or death by gunshot. Indeed, at the end of the story, kompeni can kill Sogol after his mother is arrested, but the resistant spirit against the colonizers becomes the dominant discourse told to the ludruk spectators. Interestingly, there were some similar popular stories which also included resistant discourse, such as *Sarip Tambak Oso, Sawunggaling, Pak Sakerah, Joko Sembung,* etc.

The question, then, is why ludruk artists in this period performed resistant stories. There are some reasonable answers for the question considering historical contexts of the rebirth of ludruk during the New Order in Indonesia. The control of military apparatuses toward ludruk groups and artists in 1970s was not merely in the administrative and political sense, but also in the meaning of production. As the ruling class in the formation of the state regime, the military apparatuses might

have also managed and commanded the ludruk artists to disseminate particular discourses. The resistant stories against kompeni were chosen because, though they did not carry the military struggles as represented in many film narratives, they represented and mobilized the issues of colonial revolution which emphasized physical fighting as conducted by the military troops in the past. In other words, although the civil folk heroes played a dominant role in the stories, the discourse implemented in them was militarism. This discourse was very significant for the state regime because they wanted to negotiate their authority. Hence, the negotiation of militarism became a consensual base that might engender the people's agreement toward the operations of the regime.

The further consequence of the state's control was a lessening of critiques of injustice in the societies through ludruk performances. Susanto stated:

> "Ludruk in the New Order period was indeed becoming 'the loudspeaker' of the government. Ludruk performances articulated the regime's propaganda, particularly the promotion of the government's programs, such as family planning (KB), the five-year development plant, etc. Such conditions caused the peoples' enthusiasm toward ludruk to decrease. They felt ludruk performances did not articulate social problems and emphasize the voices of proletariats. There were not the sharp critiques to the government policies and programs. Everything related to the regime was articulated in good manners. The humor scenes and kidungans had no more critical sense and merely seemed to become the formal speeches of the information agency." (Interview, 12 November 2013)

Indeed the popularity of ludruk as a folk art, which brought critical voices on the stage, changed into the state's important cultural medium to disseminate their policies and programs. This discursive intervention aimed to extend the political acceptance among people and support the superiority of the new regime with promising authority, particularly in deserving economic welfare through various modern breakthroughs namely 'pembangunan nasional' (national development). Under such conditions, ludruk artists could not gain independent voices because, administratively and ideologically, they were controlled by the regime. In this subordinate position, what they could do was follow the preferable discursive tendencies, exposing and mobilizing the importance of moral and cultural teachings, which supported the establishment of hegemonic power.

Although all ludruk artists in East Java ought to have obeyed what the regime wanted, they could also negotiate their importance, particularly in the context of preserving the existence of ludruk as folk art in the midst of a modern cultural atmosphere. By getting permission from military apparatuses, although without the freedom of expression, they could continue their creative activities, entertain the spectators, and gain some economic benefits. At least they might have an ideal dream that this folk art could compete with the massive popularity of cultural industries, such as television programs, films, and music products, although it was too hard to have a similar position and achievement since the regime gave industrial creators and capitalist producers more opportunity to develop their commercial cultural products. Further, ludruk artists also might have dreamt that one day the regime would give them a little chance to develop and empower ludruk performances.

In the 1980s, that dream came into reality when the military apparatuses pulled back their administrative position in controlling ludruk performances. As for the implications of such policy, some ludruk groups in Surabaya, Mojokerto, Jombang, and Malang were allowed to create strategy, both in managerial skills and discursive patterns, although it did not mean they reached totally freedom in representing the crucial problems in society. In a managerial and creative sense, some famous ludruk artists from Surabaya, Mojokerto, and Malang began to find a newer strategy of performance to enlarge their spectators into villages when pop cultural products were dominant in cities such as Surabaya. *Gedongan*, a

model of performance in the Soekarno era in which a ludruk group performed in city public places in temporal times (commonly in a week or a month) by selling tickets to its spectators as well as theatre models (Samidi, 2006), was not suitable anymore because the city people preferred to view films. Considering such unfortunate conditions, some ludruk groups from Surabaya (*Baru Budi, Susana,* and *RRI*), Mojokerto (*Karya Budaya*), and Jombang (*Kartika Jaya*) began finding breakthroughs to widen their targeted spectators by bringing their performances into village areas. They formulated *tobongan*, a model of performance for two or three months in villages' squares that were encircled by using *gedhek* (walls made from bamboo) and the spectators should buy one night ticket.

In tobongan, the resistant stories were still very popular and developmental discourses were still becoming dominant elements. Indeed, the stories told and taught the spectators about the primacy of resisting colonial authority as the base of fertilizing nationalism. Furthermore, the mobilization of binary oppositions between the heroes and the enemies, in this case namely colonizers, might internalize and indoctrinate the importance of taking a strict position under the label of national belonging. By this politico-aesthetical construction, people would always be aware of the dangerous and negative effects of western cultural values as symbolized by the Dutch colonizers. The question then is why the New Order regime via ludruk artists and performances needed such anti-colonial nationalism, while in the previous period many thinkers and creative persons had fertilized a dynamic concept of nationalism, which enabled them to "import" various ideological discourses as its foundation. For us, it is crucial to understand the national development programs as a historical context of the cultural process, which particularly involved folk arts.

One typical characteristic of national development programs was the industrial revolution in big cities such as Jakarta and Surabaya in which the regime invited as many people as possible to the foreign and national investors to invest their financal capital in the name of progress. The regime also allowed foreign pop culture, particularly from the USA and European countries, which were banned in Soekarno era through import mechanisms. Unavoidably, the ideological consequence of the policies was the growth of capitalism as the dominant determinant in all aspects of life for Indonesian people, from cities to the villages (Faruk, 1995). A further implication was the wide spread of individualism, which emphasized individual freedom in the midst of societies. For the state apparatuses, this freedom, particularly in thoughts and cultural expressions, might raise critiques of the government that would disturb their power. Hence, the discursive practices of communalism, morality, and anti-colonial nationalism via residual but still popular arts, such as ludruk, were preventive strategies to block "the blossoming" of a resistant spirit. In other words, the state regime used traditional cultures, in this case, ludruk performances that were *renewed* and *reinvested* with politico-ideological discourses through resistant stories, as their endeavor, to prevent the rising dissatisfaction, critiques, and resistance which were naturalized as national threats, and also to secure the consensual base of their hegemonic authority.

Indeed ludruk directors began creating stories about love and daily social problems, but the solution of all conflicts always had moralistic conclusions or harmony among the characters. We can find the similar resolutions in Indonesian film narratives in the 1980s, in which the higher tense of conflicts between individuals with their families or societies were resolved by their return into the warmth of families as the metaphor of integration (Khrisna Sen, 2010). However, despite such morality and integrative discourses, love stories can be read as an aesthetic tactic, both for appropriating modernity as the dominant culture and negotiating the existence of ludruk as one of the residual folk arts in the midst of cultural changes as a direct impact of the rapid growth of popular culture. At least, to a minimum degree, ludruk artists still could position themselves and their traditional-based

creativities with a modern orientation in cultural contestation.

Table 2
Number of Ludruk Groups in East Java during the New Order Period

Year	Number of Ludruk Group
1984	789
1985-1986	771
1986-1987	621
1987-1988	525
1994	14

Source: "Kesenian Ludruk", http://x7smaneta.blogspot.com/2012/05/kesenian-ludruk.html. Retrieved on 1 October 2013.

Despite the hegemony of the state regime, the number of ludruk groups in East Java in the New Order period started decreasing. The boom of ludruk in the early 1980s indicated a euphoric response of the New Order regime's cultural policy, which allowed ludruk artists to have performances, both in cities and villages. The popularity of tobongan that was influenced by the increase of ludruk groups was in line with the economic progress of villagers as the result of the green revolution and modern farming system, from which they received greater financial income. Besides that, access to modern entertainment was very limited for the villagers. However, the rapid advance of popular culture made the number of ludruk groups decrease gradually from 1985-1988. In the context of villages, many rich families who received financial advantages from successful harvests bought "black and white televisions" to view popular programs in TVRI (*Television of Republic Indonesia*), such as metropolitan industrial music ('Selecta Pop', 'Aneka Ria Safari', 'Kamera Ria', and 'Album Minggu Ini') and films ('Film Cerita Akhir Pekan'). Gradually, the villagers began consuming pop culture and were less interested in traditional performing arts, such as ludruk, although they did not abandon them completely (Setiawan, 2012).

In the early 1990s, the number of ludruk groups decreased radically, because only a few villagers went to tobongan. Such conditions made ludruk groups lose their spectators and, of course, their income. Finally, many of them collapsed and stopped performing. The radical diminution of ludruk groups in 1994 was the direct consequence of accessible private televisions in village regions. The villagers preferred watching various and colorful programs on private televisions, such as sinetron (*sinema elektronik*, soap operas), popular music, and sports on RCTI, SCTV, Indosiar, and ANTV. Furthermore, the popularity of *layar tancap*—a local term for open-air movies—also contributed to the disappearance of tobongan from the village cultural sphere. Since this period, ludruk groups have performed in *teropan*, a model of performance in which particular groups perform in a *terop*—a temporal stage—to serve rich villagers' family rituals or in villages' communal rituals. In this new mode of performance, the resistant and daily problem-based stories were still popular, showing that the New Order's ideological discourses still operated, although gradually it began losing its dominant and effective power when national economic crisis occurred in 1997 and various complicated problems emerged.

CREATIVE SURVIVAL STRATEGY IN THE ERA OF MARKET CULTURE

The booming of the cheap Chinese VCD players in the 2000s quickened the radical cultural change in villages. The shorter time duration of entertainment programs, the variation of programs, and the colorful techno-cultural products contributed to the marginalization of some folk arts in East Java, including ludruk. Besides that, the lack of attention of regional state regimes to their cultural policies also contributed to the death of many folk art groups in Mojokerto, Jombang, Surabaya, and Malang (Susanto, interview, 12 November 2013). In Surabaya, a city where Cak Durasim popularized ludruk as a medium for revolution, the state apparatuses negate the historical traces of ludruk and give it no attention (*Kompas*, 4 June 2002). Of course, the absence of the state regime in developing folk

arts, including ludruk, shows their inconsistency in positioning national cultural assets, which are said to bear sublime moral values as national identity. Ironically, the state regime also issues cultural national policies, namely "creative industries" and performing arts, to become one of the important sectors in the policy. Indeed, in an ideal concept, creative industries will generate a creative economy, which may give economic benefits, both for their actors and the state. But, they require constructive programs, particularly preliminary research to find suitable models based on the cultural and creative human resources, and the state's initiatives which will drive social actors, intellectuals, capitalists, and creative communities to succeed in a creative industry policy that will produce welfare for all (Primorac, 2005; Miles and Green, 2008). Unfortunately, in Indonesia, the government—central and regional—still does not have definitive programs to improve folk art-based, creative industries.

However, there are some internal factors that make ludruk group numbers decrease in the Reformation period. Firstly, ludruk performances fail to fulfill economic necessity, so many artists leave this folk art (Musyawir, 2013). Secondly, there are many groups that have no fixed members, which forces them to hire amateur artists with lower capacity when they are invited to perform. According to Hengky Kusuma, a researcher, these "name-board ludruk" can only survive in short periods of time and will disappear sooner because there is no commitment from their members (*Radar Mojokerto*, 31st December 2010). Thirdly, the narrative structure of ludruk performance with its long duration seems too traditional compared to modern popular arts. Fourthly, the slow ludruk artist regeneration causes difficulties in finding new and young talents, so the viewers are not too interested to come to ludruk performances which are played by older artists around 50-70 years old. The traditional management in ludruk groups makes their leaders/managers take serious consideration when they want to substitute an older artist with a younger one (*Surabaya Post*, 20th September 2008). Sixthly, the lack of intellectual figures in ludruk groups who can handle managerial business and create innovative breakthroughs relating to stories and stage management, may cause ludruk seems conventional and uninteresting to watch, especially for younger generations.

As a creative survival strategy in facing and solving the above problems, some ludruk groups are finding some breakthroughs, both in production management and stories. Consequently, these groups can still survive and get many performance jobs, both from rich villagers and cultural institutions. According to Hengky Kusuma's notes, there are five top ludruk groups in East Java based on their performance intensity, namely (1) Ludruk *Karya Budaya* Mojokerto; (2) Ludruk *Budhi Wijaya* Mojokerto; (3) Ludruk *Mustika Jaya* Jombang; (4) Ludruk *Karya Baru* Mojokerto; and (5) Ludruk *Putra Wijaya* Jombang ("Kidung Cinta Ludruk Kota", http://dongengdalam.blogspot.com/2008/02/kidung-cinta-ludruk-kota.html, retrieved on October 5, 2013). The five groups are very popular because of the ability and capacity of their managers in formulating organizational management based on modern knowledge and because of their creative directors in creating new or up-to-date stories and staging innovations. Because of their creative capacity, those groups receive 6,000,000 rupiah to 7,000,000 rupiah for a terop performance.

In the context of managerial and staging breakthroughs, according to Susanto, Ludruk *Karya Budaya* has applied some innovative methods as a serious attempt to compete in the market era today (interview, 12 November 2013). The first method is in revitalizing the classic mechanism of regeneration, namely *nyebeng, sepelan,* and *tedean.* Nyebeng is the observation conducted by younger artists when their seniors are performing on stage. Sepelan is an agreement to speak or to act between the younger and the senior artists when they are playing in the same scene. Tedean is mandatory for the younger artists to ask for advice and critiques from the senior artists about the action in particular scenes that they have done or will do. Through this revitalization, ludruk groups may find

a suitable solution for regeneration problems. The second method, which is contradictory to the classic methods, is hosting acting and staging workshops that can enrich the creative skills of the artists. Through workshops, they can create new dances, techniques of acting, and techniques of directing, etc. The improved skills gained through workshops, at least, will make ludruk performances better and more creative, so it will encourage more viewers to attend performances. The third method relates to the second method, which is recruiting creative people who can give more knowledge on the world of staging, from sound systems, lightening systems, and other aesthetic elements. The fourth method is improving ludruk management by combining traditional and modern systems, so the ludruk artists can experience the impressive communal atmosphere during the performances and can find maximum beneficiaries, especially for financial income, through better managerial mechanisms. The members of *Karya Budaya*, for example, always get two kinds of annual bonuses, before Idul Fitri (the Moslems' greatest holiday) and at the end of the year because their manager always saves a part of their honors in each performance. Each member will receive 1,500,000-2,000,000 rupiah. This can happen because through creative and innovative breakthroughs, *Karya Budaya* can receive 150 job invitations in a year, a high quantity for folk art.

Based on our participatory observation during *Karya Budaya's* performance in a village in Mojokerto, we conclude that the above breakthroughs give marvelous effects on the popularity of this group. Indeed, there is no change in the structure of the performance—chronologically starting from kidungans, *remo* (a welcoming dance), Javanese musical show, *lawakan* (humor), and story. Karyo, one of the spectators out of hundreds that night, comments on the performance as follows:

> "In Mojokerto, you will find similar conditions. Hundreds of spectators come when *Karya Budaya* performs. This group is outstanding. Each artist has great quality, both in remo and in acting as a character in a story. The lighting technology and sound system give us a different situation, because we seem to be entering into a traditional performance with modern taste. A full-color stage also gives us enjoyment in watching the story. Indeed, in the middle phase of the story, many children and teenagers leave the performance, but there are about two hundred spectators who enjoy the story until the end at dawn." (Interview, 28 November 2013)

The using of the recent lighting technology and sound system creates an incredible combination between folk art and modern technology. It indicates that the spectators today are very accustomed to modern technology since they watch television programs and listen to music on VCDs, so when a stage manager uses them in the performance, they are very excited. The aesthetic capacity of Karya Budaya's artists as a result of internal workshops also contribute to the spectators' interest in this group because there are creative techniques of dancing and acting that make the performance interactive.

Nevertheless, the creation of newer stories relating to contemporary social problems also takes an important role as a survival strategy because ludruk's top competitors are *sinetron* (Indonesian soap opera on private television) and films, which have more interesting and complicated stories based on real problems. Historically, ludruk has been tied in relationships between social conditions and historical contexts as we have discussed in the previous subchapters. This means that it is not difficult for ludruk directors or scriptwriters to compose newer stories based on people's daily problems, although most of them are more interested, driven by their pragmatic thinking and traces of popularity of colonial stories in public memory, to perform *Sarip Tambakoso, Pak Sakera, Joko Sambang,* and other resistant stories. In a critical sense, the creation of newer stories is important to gradually clear the hegemonic effects of militarism and to regain a closer relationship of ludruk with their viewers who commonly came from the lower classes and villages.

In this Reformation era, people experience

many various social, economic, political, environmental, and cultural problems. All of them can be an imaginative and creative basis for ludruk artists and directors that can be transferred into kidungan, humor, stories, and other staging actions. Although they cannot give a practical solution for the problems, the articulation of them may make the spectators feel like they are being accurately represented in ludruk performances. Paring Waluyo and Happy Budhi (2007) argue that by recognizing and understanding the viewers' daily habits and problems, ludruk artists can create stories, humor, and kidungans that intertwine with values and events that are understandable and memorable. Some ludruk groups have actually begun creating contemporary social problem- based stories in their performances to attract viewers. *Karya Budaya*, for example, in some occasions, has performed *Juragan Dhemit* (The Devil Employer) and *Warisan Mak Yah* (The Heritage of *Mak* Yah), two stories that depict the complicated, real problems in our societies.

The first story focuses on the misery of Saodah, a female housekeeper, who is raped and impregnated by her employer. However, the employer does not acknowledge his child. The story actually represents the struggle and the dread of many lower-class women who want to reach economic welfare by working as housekeepers in Indonesia or abroad.

> "*Juragan Dhemit* is a social story which commonly happens in our society today. Many young women arrive in big cities and go abroad as housekeepers. Indeed, they can improve their familial economic condition by doing this. However, we often hear and read many tragic stories experienced by them. Therefore, we create the story through which we criticize social problems and remind common people, particularly women, who want to go to big cities and abroad." (Susanto, interview, 12 November 2013)

Kompas (18th March 2006) describes the story as follows:

> Saodah came back to the kampong with a strange appearance. Her parents found Saodah quieter than before. Three years ago, she often sent money from her wages as a housekeeper in Mr. Brojo Utoyo's family. It did not taking a long time. Her father realized what was happening; she was pregnant. Before her home coming, her two male friends, Supali and Trubus forced Mr. Brojo to acknowledge the infant as his child. However, a promise is only promise. Until her child became a young boy, Mr. Brojo never acknowledged him. What was a suitable name for this kind of inhuman employer? ... The artists together shouted "Juragan Dhemit". (*Kompas*, 18 March 2006)

According to *Kompas*' notes, the story received incredible appreciation from the viewers in Malang. Moreover, the lower and middle class spectators seemed to find their subjectivity in the story. That reality shows that the viewers may become appreciative of the story, which is very close to their daily problems. This means that the class conflict-based stories can be an expressive explosion that may awaken the viewers' consciousness, although it cannot help them solve their complicated problems. What is interesting from this story is that its narrative gives a newer accentuation of class-conflict in which the dominant figure does not experience a tragic ending because of his cruel actions. However, the shout, "Juragan Dhemit", at the end of the story offers the spectators a memorable discourse and gives a critical warning that in our own societies, there are still "colonizers" which need to be resisted.

The second story, *Warisan Mak Yah*, negotiates the anti-thesis of the stereotypical viewpoint on prostitution, which positions female prostitutes as "social rubbish". Susanto explained:

> "Mak Yah was a daughter of a Dutch navy officer and a whore from Kupang, Surabaya. Her father went back to the Netherlands and her mother died when she was young. Her mother's friends, who also worked as prostitutes, called the child Mak Yah. Living in the midst of prostitution made Mak Yah follow the profession of her adopted mothers, and she became a prostitute. Because of her mixed Javanese-Dutch blood, her face and body were more interesting than other whores' were. She became an idol for male costumers.

> When she got old, Mak Yah lived alone in a silent kampong. Nevertheless, she still worked hard, although some serious diseases infected her body. She also became a victim of negative social stigma in her community. There was nobody who might visit her and give her their sympathy. However, before she died, she wrote in her will by the local apparatuses that they might sell her house and land. Then, they should use half of the money for renovating the broken kindergarten building. Moreover, the other half was for buying 'a carrier for her dead body.'" (Interview, 12 November 2004)

This story clearly criticizes the stereotype and stigmatic public opinion on prostitution without considering seriously its historical roots. As a culmination of the critique, the story offers a different perspective in which Mak Yah makes a constructive, positive, and visionary decision related to crucial problems in her community (*Radar Mojokerto*, 4th October 2004). For example, through the renovation of the kindergarten building, Mak Yah firstly wants to show her neighbors the importance of educating children for the sake of knowledge. Secondly, she wants to give a kind of teaching that in "the darkest side" of a prostitute there may be "a shining sun" which can improve the poorer social conditions.

Those two stories indicate the bravery of *Karya Budaya* in representing contemporary social problems in their performances. Of course, the freedom in the Reformation period contributes to critical imagination and discourse, which pass beyond the established moral codes in society. The lessening of the state regime apparatuses' control in cultural expressions—although not totally absent, especially relating to communism issues—makes cultural actors, including ludruk artists, start creating stories that were forbidden in the previous period. Indeed, in the New Order period, many ludruk groups performed stories about prostitution, as well as the same stories in films, but the resolutions of the conflicts always emphasized the importance of a harmonious ending in which the prostitutes were re-integrated to the established moral codes, meaning they became a "normal person." Similarly, in the context of class struggle, we can find a critical aesthetic assessment, which reminds the spectators about the dangers of human exploitation by the same citizens from the upper class. In other words, although in the Reformation period, the slogan of equality in human rights and democracy echoes every moment, both in television programs and academic forums, the problems of *ordinary colonization* conducted by the dominant class is still happening.

Despite the above ideal critical functions, once again, the intertwining between narratives and contextual conditions may become a suitable strategy in re-popularizing ludruk in the midst of techno-cultural expansion. Indeed this strategy entails the popularity of sinetron and films as the products of huge capital cultural industries, but since ludruk performances have their distinctive staging aspects, it does not matter to absorb and appropriate a similar strategy. In the context of production, some ludruk groups have become associated with recording industries from Surabaya to record their performances and distribute them in VCDs. On one side, this choice suppresses the normally long duration—5-6 hours—to a short one at only 1 hour, and on the other side, it may reduce the complicated stories and discourses. Nevertheless, in the context of creative industries, the choice is understandable because the recording of the ludruk performance means giving the ludruk artists additional income from the payment of the contract. In each contract, commonly for two stories, Karya Budaya gets 25 million rupiah and this payment will be shared to 60 members proportionally. Furthermore, the distribution of VCDs may reach a larger audience, from cities to villages, and may attract some of them to invite the group for their family or communal rituals. However, live performances are still the major orientation of ludruk groups because the artists can experience direct and dynamic communication with the spectators, so they will get different psychological satisfaction. In addition, economically, many live performances mean more money for them.

CONCLUSION

In its historical process, ludruk—through its creative members and managers—has used transformation as strategy to survive in complicated social, economic, political, and cultural conditions. In the era of Soekarno's regime, when revolutionary ideology, guided by democracy, became the dominant discursive practice and formation, many ludruk groups and artists were involved in Lekra because this institution was committed to empower proletarian cultures. This politico-ideological involvement, truly, might have made ludruk a prestigious and critical folk art, but it also caused them to come into misery. In the New Order period, ludruk performances experienced a *turning point* in their transformative process. From the early to the middle part of the period, many ludruk groups existed in cultural spheres by transforming and negotiating the state's ideological discourses on nationalism and national development as a way to engender and distribute hegemonic power among the masses. However, their popularity decreased radically as a consequence of rapid development, which caused changes in villagers' cultural tastes. The collapse of many ludruk groups in the mid to late 1990s also contributed to the decrease of public consensual agreement toward the New Order regime because their ideological discourses could not reach the masses through ludruk performances anymore.

In recent times, many ludruk groups find problems that are more complicated in continuing their creative processes. Some serious internal problems and the greater competition with techno-cultural materials produced by huge capitalist industries make many ludruk artists and managers give up and stop their performances. However, a few ludruk groups in Mojokerto and Jombang have begun constructing and practicing a transformative strategy by appropriating modern trends in staging elements and management. They have also created newer stories related to contemporary daily problems. By these transformative strategies, ludruk groups, on one side, can continuously spread contextual and critical stories that represent the recent social, economic, and cultural problems in more interesting performances. On other side, ludruk artists may gain economic benefits when they can have many terops and recorded performances for digital distribution. We consider that through these transformational practices, ludruk artists and managers can find suitable breakthroughs by operating mixed managerial systems—combining the traditional, communal values with modern and professional mechanisms—and creating innovation in stories and staging. This transformative strategy, once again, can become a starting and continuing point for ludruk artists in positioning and empowering their groups in the market capitalistic era that is colored by the industrialization of cultures, whether traditional, modern, or experimental.

REFERENCES

Aschroft, Bill. (2002). *Post-colonial Future: Transformation of Postcolonial Culture*. London: Continuum.

____. (2001). *Post-colonial Transformation*. London: Routledge.

Boggs, Carl. (1984). *The Two Revolution: Gramsci and the Dilemmas of Western Marxism*. Boston: South End Press.

Faruk. (1995). *Perlawanan Tak Kunjung Usai: Sastra, Politik, dan Dekonstruksi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Foucault, M. (1989). *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (English trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith). London: Routledge.

____. (1998). *The Will to Knowledge, The History of Sexualities Volume 1* (English trans. Robert Hurley). London: Penguin Books.

____. (1981). The Order of Discourse. In Robert Young, *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader* (pp. 48-78). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Gramsci, A. (2006). (i) History of the Subaltern Classes; (ii) the Concept of "Ideology"; (iii) Cultural Themes: Ideological Material. In In M.G. Durham & D.M. Kellner, *Media*

and Cultural Studies Keyworks (pp. 13-17). Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.

"Gusti Allah Pun Ngunduh Mantu", *Tempo*, 30th September – 6th October 2013.

Howson, Richard & Kylie Smith. (2008). Hegemony and the Operation of Consensus and Coercion. In Richard Howson & Kylie Smith, *Hegemony: Studies in Consensus and Coercion* (pp. 1-15) London: Routledge.

Ishommudin. (2013). Sejarah Kelam Ludruk Saat Peristiwa 1965. *Tempo.* Retrieved on October 1, 2013 from http://www.tempo.co/read/news/2013/10/01/173518012/Sejarah-Kelam-Ludruk-Saat-Peristiwa-1965/1/2.

Joseph, Jonathan. (2002). Hegemony: *A Realist Analysis*. London: Routledge.

"Kebiasaan Pemain Comotan Dikritik", *Radar Mojokerto*, 31st December 2010.

Kesenian Ludruk. Retrieved on October 1, 2013 from http://x7smaneta.blogspot.com/2012/05/kesenian-ludruk.html.

Kidung Cinta Ludruk Kota. Retrieved on October 5 2013 from http://dongengdalam.blogspot.com/2008/02/kidung-cinta-ludruk-kota.html.

"Ludruk Terhambat Regenerasi", *Surabaya Post*, 20th September 2008.

"Masih Untung", *Kompas Edisi Jawa Timur*, 4th June 2002.

Miles, I and L. Green. 2008. *Hidden Innovation in the Creative Industries*. United Kingdom: Nesta.

Musyawir. (2013). Kesenian Ludruk di Bumi Majapahit Nyaris Hilang. *Kompas.* Retrieved on August 15, 2013 from http://oase.kompas.com/read/2013/03/18/23381457/Kesenian.Ludruk.di.Bumi.Majapahit.Nyaris.Hilang.

Peacock, J. (1968). *Rites of Modernization: Symbol and Social Aspects of Indonesian Proletarian Drama.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

"Persiapan Ludruk Karya Budaya Ikuti Festival Ludruk Jatim 2004, Siapkan Lakon Warisan Mak Yah", *Radar Mojokerto*, 4th October 2004.

Primorac, J. (2005). *The Position of Cultural Workers in Creative Industries: Southeastern Perspectives*. Zagreb: European Cultural Foundation.

Samidi. (2006). Teater Tradisional di Surabaya 1950-1965: Relasi Masyarakat dan Rombongan Seni. *Humaniora*, Vol.18, No. 3, 236-245.

"Saodah, Nasibmu Mirip Nasibku", *Kompas* Edisi Jawa Timur, 18th March 2006.

Sen, Krishna. (2010). *Kuasa dalam Sinema: Negara, Masyarakat, dan Sinema Orde Baru* (trans. Windu W.J.). Yogyakarta: Penerbit Ombak.

Setiawan, Ikwan. (2011). Modernitas, Lokalitas, dan Poskolonialitas Masyarakat Desa di Era 80-an. *Literasi*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 116-133.

Subiyantoro, Slamet. (2010). "Transformasi Loro Blonyo-Rumah Joglo dalam Analisis Struktural". *Jurnal Humaniora*, 22, 327-335.

Supriyanto, H. (1992). *Lakon Ludruk Jawa Timur*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia.

Susanto, E. E. (2012). "Ludruk Masa Lalu, Masa Kini, dan Masa Depan", *Radar Mojokerto*, 27th May 2012.

Waluyo, P and H. Budhi (2007). "Ludruk pun Menyentuh Lumpur Lapindo", *Surya*, 6th May 2007.

Williams, R. (2006). Base and Superstructure in Marxist Theory. In M.G. Durham & D.M. Kellner, *Media and Cultural Studies Keyworks* (pp. 130-142). Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.

INTERVIEW

Karyo, a spectator of Karya Budaya's performance in Trowulan Mojokerto, interview, 28 November 2013.

Susanto, E. E, the Manager of Ludruk *Karya Budaya*, Mojokerto, interview, 12 November 2013.